

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1-16 and 18 are rejected. Claims 17 and 19-26 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1, 4-16 and 18 are amended. Claim 1 is amended to state the method in more conventional terms and to incorporate the subject matter of claims 2 and 3. The remaining amendments are intended to provide better grammar and to delete reference numbers that may be unnecessarily limiting. Claims 2, 3, 17 and 19-26 are cancelled.

Election/Restriction

Claims 17 and 19-26 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. The Examiner notes that an election was made without traverse in the reply filed on 10/16/07. Applicants confirm that election.

Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 6 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

The Examiner points to specific phrases as either lacking antecedent basis ("the additive" in claim 6, lns. 1-2) or as being of indefinite scope due to exemplary language ("e.g....reaction" (claim 6, lns. 2-3), ("e.g....film" (claim 12, lns. 1-2).

Applicants have corrected these bases for rejection.

Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 13, 16, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Samuelsen (USPN 6,051,249). This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

First, as to claims 2 and 3, the rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of the claims. However, since the limitations of those two claims are now incorporated into claim 1, the following argument is relevant to the subject matter originally set forth in claims 1-3.

As to these claims, the Examiner asserts that Samuelsen teaches the claimed process as evidenced at col. 4, lns 50-65; col. 5, lns 1-24 and 46-51; col. 6, ln 46-col. 7, ln 31; col. 8, ln 53-col. 7, ln 31; example 4; patented claims 7 and 12.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to now state that the method involves a base body and an adhesive and/or precursor of the adhesive body. Each of the base body and adhesive body are produced by an injection molding process. In particular, the adhesive body is made by using a precursor and is applied to the base body. Thus, in the mold, the base body is first made by injection molding and then the adhesive body, in the form of a precursor, is applied to the base body.

Samuelsen

Applicants respectfully submit that Samuelsen simply discloses a dressing and a method for the preparation of such a dressing. As stated in column 6, lines 45 to column 7, line 7, a carrier film or a release film are placed in a mold. The carrier film or the release film are not produced by an injection molding process.

Further, as stated in column 10, example 7, the films are very thin and have a thickness of 25 μm and 110 μm . These films according to the other examples have similar thicknesses. Films of this kind would not be made by injection molding. Instead, they are made by extrusion.

Finally, the carrier film and the release film in Samuelsen are separated in the mold using a vacuum between the films and the parts of the mold.

By contrast, according to the present invention, the base body is not placed in the mold but (1) produced in the mold (2) by injection molding. These are two important differences over Samuelsen.

Applicants respectfully submit that Samuelsen does not disclose nor suggest the method as now claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 14, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Samuelsen (USPN 6,051,249). This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

The foregoing claims are dependent from claim 1 and would be allowable for the reasons given to their parent claim. Samuelsen simply does not teach the basic process steps as expressly set forth in amended claim 1.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Alan J. Kasper/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Alan J. Kasper
Registration No. 25,426

Date: March 25, 2008